

GRS IX-5]

126-15-21-26

Previous references.

Q. 7. 742-22-1-0.
" 120-21-1-3
" 211-18-1-18
" 43-17-1-19

Later references.

smg 159-15-1-4
" 58-27-1-5
" 140-40-1-9.

1923-4

(Muzrai.)

File No. 98-24

Serial Nos. 1-3

(12)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1-3.

Part B for November 1924.

SUBJECT

Form of the Swamigala of the Sasale Khasanaya
Swami Shakti.

From The Muzrai Council in Mysore.

M. C. S. B. 10.10.11 November 1924.

States that information called for has been
submitted on receipt of reply from the
Lawdikari of the Swamig.

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 98
1924

FILE HEADING.

Tour of the Swamigal of Sri
Sole Vyasaraaya Swami Math.

From D. Nara Simha Murthi, Manager

No P. H. 11 Dated 16 10 - 24 Received 20 10 - 24

Diary No. <u>448</u>	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	—	Serial No <u>1</u>
-------------------------	---------	---------------	---	-----------------------

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

States that the Swami intends starting
on a tour for Sishyarghan, and prays
for an escort of 2 Sowars from the Mysore
Horse to guard his person and property.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Dft. calling for the Swami's tour
programmes, is submitted.

21. 10. 24 The Swami has been allowed
a Barr guard consisting of
a non commissioned Officer, and 6 depots
which has been ordered ^{from time to time} to be continued
in his service, and for the last
time in G.O. order no 3098-100

NOTES--First Sheet

WD 0560-6PB-500-9 8-22

Muz 442-22-3

Serial
No.

dated the 28th June 1923 up to
the end of June 1926. The 2 Sowars
he has now applied for are
evidently in addition to the Barr
guard he has already in his
service. In fact this Barr guard
was placed at his disposal in order
to accompany him and his munitions
paraphernalia on his tours outside
his headquarters. It ^{seems} ~~is~~ nec.
that the Chief Commr. should be
consulted as to whether the
service of 2 more Sowars can
be placed at the malt service
without detriment to military
service & discipline. It is also
nec. to enquire ^{of the Municipal} ~~whether~~ whether
the Barr guard already in the
malt service is not sufficient
and if not, ^{why} how long this add.
strength is req^d.

If approved these suggestions will
be made -

21.10.24

Rev. Secy.
11 (M)

23.10.24

Peru. 12

25.10.24

415
25.60

457
203 File No. 98

of 19 44

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

(4)

I find from a perusal of the previous files relating to the case that the deputation of a barr guard -six sepoy and one Naik was sanctioned for the purpose of accompanying the Swamigalu during the tours then proposed to be undertaken by him.

In the year 1919, the deputation was sanctioned for a further period of 3 years on the same terms as before. But when the matter came up again before the Government in 1922, the object of the original deputation of the barr guard seems to have been lost sight of, and in the order dated 13th January 1922, the continuance of the deputation till the end of June 1923 would appear to have been sanctioned for the watch and ward of the institution, i.e. the Mutt. The latest order dated 28th June 1923 also in which the continuance of the deputation was sanctioned for another 3 years seems to indicate that the barr guard was meant for the guard duty at the Mutt, which was clearly not the intention when it was first sanctioned.

5) It is desirable to have it made clear that the Mutt is not entitled to be given a barr guard for duty at the headquarters of the Mutt and that it is only while the Swamigalu is on tour that any guard can be given, if at all. This may be asked to be explained to the Swamigalu and information may be asked to be obtained and furnished on the following points:-

(1) The date on which the Swamigalu proposes

Serial
No.

NOTE-Contn. Sheet

Serial
No.

to go on tour and the probable period of the tour.

(2) Why the guard of 6 sepoy and one naik already sanctioned is not sufficient for accompanying the Swamy during the tour and if there is any need for two sowars, in addition. In case the two sowars now required in addition are sanctioned, whether the Swamigalu is willing to bear their pay and other charges under the Rules.

(3) Why the barr guard on duty at the Mutt should not be withdrawn while the Swamy is in headquarters and deputed to accompany the Swamy at the time of his starting on tour.

2 V
31/10

2
31/10/10
Res.
31/10/10

Dft. Submitted

AY 84
1. 11-24/11/10

Issue
1/11/24

- 2 As the Abhaya Commission. No. 649 of 5.11.24.
The above I request him to inform the Swami that the Mutt is not entitled to a Barr guard for duty at the Mutt headquarters. That it is only while the Swami is on tour that a guard can be given, & call for appropriate orders.

File No.

98

of 19 24.

General and Revenue
Secretariat.Serial
No

From, the Muzrai Commi

Letter no. C. 534 D 10-11-24.

Reports that there is no information as to who the applicant is and that he will submit the information on receipt of a reply from the Sarvashtikari of the Muz.

The Muz. Comm. adds that there was a pseudonymous petition complaining against the pet. and Panpatnegar Sundara Rajachar and that he sent this petition to the Sarvashtikari.

The Muz. Comm's ^{promised} further ^{detailed} report may be awaited.

Submitted

AM ^{13.11.24}
13.11.24

Received

619/22
2nd member

12/11/24

24/11/24
12/11/24

SM

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

()

, the 192

Date of issue

Signed by

Muz
98-24

Section

48 Muz

File No.

89-24

Serial No.

R

No.

To

Dear Sir,

With reference
to your letter no. C 534 & 10th
November 1924 stating that ^{you} would
submit a detailed report as to
who D. Narayana Murthi is? &
when he was appointed manager
of Sobale Vyasaraya Swami Mutt?
after getting the details from
Mr. M. Srinivasa Murthi
~~Sarvadhika~~ Sarvadhika
of the Mutt, I am desired
to request you to expedite
the submission of the
report promised.

Yours truly,

over

Subd for approval
RQ

The paper may be
filed as no report
has been recd. tho
the reg. rule was
issued 2 months
ago

RQ

27-1-25

For: maybe redressed
when begins

The. May Comm

Muz 4]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _

Muzrai Secretariat

()

, the

192

Section

File No

Serial No.

Date of issue 5-11-24 -¹⁰

The Muz. Comm

Signed by M. T. Leonard Esq.,

I am directed to forward herewith application regd no 1448 from the manager of Sri Vyasaram Swam Math praying that a escort of 2 Sowars from the Mysore Horse Regt be given to guard the

over.

property of the Swami
of the said matt during
is intended four, and
to observe ^{that it is seen} from the previous
files on the subject
that the deputation of
barr guard - six sepoy
and one Naik - was sanctioned
for the purpose of
accompanying the Swamigal
during the four years then
proposed to be undertaken
by him. In the year 1919,
the deputation was sanctioned
for a further period of
3 years on the same terms
as before. But when
the matter came up
again before the Govt
in 1922, the object of
the original deputation

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

G. R. S. 6/33]

GENERAL AND REVENUE
SECRETARIAT

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

of the barr guard
~~was~~ seems to have
been lost sight of, as
in the order dated 13th
January 1922, the con-
firmance of the deputation
for the end of
June 1923 ~~would~~ appear
to have been sanctioned
for the watch and ward
of the matt. The latest
order of 28th June 1923
also in which the con-
firmance of the
deputation was sanctioned
for another 3 years
seems to indicate that
the barr guard was
meant for the guard
duty at the matt
which was clearly not
the intention when it
was first sanctioned.
I am ~~to~~ ^{across the} ~~renewed~~

You will be so good as
to ^{make it clear to the Matt} explain to the Swainigala

that the Matt is not
entitled to be given a
man guard for duty at
the headquarters of the Matt
and that it is only while
the Swami is on tour

that any guard can be
given, at all, ~~but obtain~~ I am also to request that
and furnish information on the following points: —
the following points: —
furnished to go as early
as possible

(1) the date on which
the Swainigala proposes
to go on tour and the
probable period of the
tour,

(2) why the guard of 6
Sepoys and 1 Native already
sanctioned is not sufficient
for accompanying the Swami
during the tour and whether
there is any need
for 2 Swamis in addition.

G. R. S. G/33]

GENERAL AND REVENUE
SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

(3) In case the two Sowars
now required in addition
are sanctioned, whether
the Swanigalar is willing
to bear their pay and
other charges under
the Rules.

(4) Why the Barr Guard
on duty at the Matt
should not be withdrawn
while the Swami is in
Head Quarters and
deputed to accompany
the Swami at the
time of his starting
on tour

I have etc

1.11.24
26-7-24
R. S. S. S. S.
S. S. S. S. S.
17/11/24

No. C 534/24-25

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore 10th November 1924.

From

K. Chandy, Esquire., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

B a n g a l o r e.

GEN. 2
11 NOV 1924
MUZRAI

Dr. 6/11

To

K. V. Anantaraman, Esquire., B.A.,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 649/M.F.98-24-2 dated 5th -- November 1924, regarding the Barr-guard lent to the Sri Sosale Vyasaraya-Swami Matha, I have the honor to state that no information is available as to who the applicant D. Narasimha murti is, when he was appointed as manager and whether he has any locus standi to address communications in the name of the Swamigalu. Properly speaking the request for an escort of Sowars ought to have come from the Swamigalu or from Mr. M. Srinivasa Murti, the Sarvadhikari whose appointment as such has been recognized by Government.

I have, however, placed myself in communication with the Sarvadhikari and shall submit the detailed information required by you on receipt of a reply from the latter.

2. In this connection, I beg to state that some days back a ----- pseudonymous petition ~~present~~ purporting to be from the well-wishers of the Matha was received by me wherein it was stated that the present applicant and Parpathegar Sundararajachar were mismanaging the affairs and that -- they had come to Bangalore with ample funds to secure the deputation of a set of Sowars and that the concession should not be allowed and that the petition was sent to the Sarvadhikari with my letter of the 25th October 1924.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K. Chandy

Muzrai Commissioner

(SR.